



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/532,513

04/25/2005

Carlos Martins

RFR0062

7073

27305

7590

03/20/2008

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS, P.C.  
THE PINEHURST OFFICE CENTER, SUITE #101  
39400 WOODWARD AVENUE  
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-5151

EXAMINER

TAPOLCAI, WILLIAM E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3744

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/20/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/532,513	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MARTINS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> William E. Tapolcai	<b>Art Unit</b> 3744	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15 and 17-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15 and 17-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 3744

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 15, 17-23, 25-30, and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,340,053 to Wu et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,274,482 to Sonoda. Wu et al discloses the claimed invention of a heat exchanger having a plurality of stacked plates which each have separate internal flow channels for the two fluids. The plates are clearly arranged in groups of plates. However, Wu et al does not disclose the fluid passes to be defined in one direction from the inlet to the outlet of the respective flow channels. Sonoda teaches a plate-type heat exchanger in which the stacked plates clearly have internal flow channels in which the fluid flows in one direction from the inlet to the outlet. See for example Fig. 3, where the fluid flow pattern is clearly shown. Thus, it would be obvious to substitute, for the stacked plates of Wu et al, stacked plates of the type taught in Sonoda, to yield the predictable result that the flow pattern is simplified and the heat exchanger is easy to manufacture. Wu et al further discloses turbulence generators 60 and 62 between the plates. The type of fluid used is considered to be a matter of obvious choice to one of ordinary skill in the art. No criticality or unexpected results are seen or have been disclosed for the fluids to be refrigerant and cooling fluid. Furthermore, the recitation in the claims of the heat exchanger being a condenser is considered to be a statement of intended use and not a positive structural limitation. There is no positive recitation in the claims of the heat

exchanger as being part of a refrigeration system in which the heat exchanger is located between a compressor and an expansion device. Also, the heat exchangers described in either Wu et al or Sonoda are fully capable of being used as condensers in a refrigeration system. Likewise, the recitation in the claims of the heat exchanger being for a motor vehicle is considered to be a mere statement of intended use.

3. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al in view of Sonoda as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,628,206 to Baba. Wu et al as modified above by Sonoda discloses the claimed invention except for the bottle build between the first and second series of plates. Baba teaches a condenser comprising a series of stacked plates and a bottle or reservoir 33 adjacent the plates. Thus, it would be obvious to provide Wu et al with a bottle or reservoir, in view of Baba, to yield the predictable result of providing an expansion container for the heat exchanger. The location of the bottle or reservoir with respect to the plates is considered to be a matter of obvious choice to one of ordinary skill in the art. No criticality or unexpected results are seen or have been disclosed for the claimed location of the bottle or reservoir. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have expected Applicant's invention to work equally as well as with the device of Baba.

4. Applicant's arguments filed January 22, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's remarks regarding the single fluid pass are believed to be taught by Sonoda. Since both Wu et al and Sonoda are directed to heat exchangers of the stacked-plate type, it is considered that one of ordinary skill in the heat exchanger

art would be able to modify Wu et al in accordance with the teachings of Sonoda to provide stacked plates that have fluid passed in one direction.

5. Furthermore, the heat exchangers of both Wu et al and Sonoda are capable of being used as condensers in refrigeration systems. One of ordinary skill in the heat exchange art would certainly recognize that a condenser in a refrigeration system is a type of heat exchanger, and would be able to modify the heat exchangers of either Wu et al or Sonoda to fit in a refrigeration system without undue experimentation.

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William E. Tapolcai whose telephone number is (571) 272-4814. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs., 6:30 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl J. Tyler can be reached on (571) 272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William E. Tapolcai/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3744

William E. Tapolcai  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3744

wet  
March 13, 2008